

REMARKS

35 U.S.C. § 102

The Ulinski reference cannot anticipate the currently pending claims. The Ulinski reference discloses only a system for a static, installed photocopy machine with some processing being connected to a separate computer. The currently pending claims all structurally recite that they are for repairs to a “mobile machine” selected from the group consisting of an agricultural machine, a construction machine and a forestry machine, which obviously cannot be anticipated by a photocopier (and is not an analogous art).

Moreover, the Ulinski reference teaches direct hardwire telecommunications between a fixed static machine and a home, central computer. The Ulinski reference nowhere discloses, let alone teaches, repair planning for a mobile machine having a diagnostic system on board where the repair planning is produced by the interaction of two computers, central and remote, that are not on board the machine being repaired. Because the recited claim limitation to systems for mobile machines is not found in the Ulinski reference, Ulinski cannot anticipate the pending claims. The same is true for all the claims that depend from claim 1.

Conclusively, no reference on record discloses separate databases as claimed for pre-service life design changes and service life repair history, as are now claimed.

The office action appears to misread claim 16, now presented in claims 32 and 40. Claim 16, 32 and 40 do not claim sending data from the central processor to the machine, as is stated in the office action, but clearly recite the transmission of data from the

machine's diagnostic system to the local computer system. No such structure or step is disclosed in any of the prior art references of record.

35 U.S.C. § 103


For the same reasons as stated above, the Ulinski reference cannot suggest or motivate the system structurally recited in the pending claims and in fact it teaches away from it by teaching a direct communication between the machine to be repaired, the photocopier, and the central computer. Since this is unworkable for the application of the present invention regarding mobile machines such as tractors, the teaching of Ulinski does not enable, suggest or motivate the system recited in the pending claims.

This novel and inventive distinction is inherent in the previous claims' recitation of repair of mobile machines. The current amendments to independent claim 1 that the local computer system is independent of the mobile machine itself further particularly points out and distinctly claims the inventive distinctions of the pending claims over the references of record, but does not narrow.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Robert C. Haldiman, Reg. No. 45,437
Husch & Eppenger, LLC
190 Carondelet Plaza
St. Louis, MO 63105
314-480-1500
314-480-1505 (FACSIMILE)